



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/715,478 | 11/17/2000 | Beth Anne Allison | 2196/1E500 | 7552 |
| 25225 | 7590 | 06/07/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 3811 VALLEY CENTRE DRIVE SUITE 500 SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2332 | | | HUI, SAN MING R | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1617 | |

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/715,478

Applicant(s)

ALLISON ET AL.

Examiner

San-ming Hui

Art Unit

1617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.


NOTE: _____

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.Claim(s) objected to: 7 and 8.Claim(s) rejected: 1-6 and 9-20.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____



Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply and terminal disclaimer filed May 3, 2004 has overcome the following rejection(s): Obviousness Double Patenting rejection and rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's rebuttal arguments averring the in vitro data taught in Sobeh et al. and Dartsch et al. have already been addressed in the office action mailed December 3, 2003. The in vitro data or experiments taught in Sobeh and Dartsch merely pointing out the effectiveness of using photodynamic method to inhibit the proliferation of vascular smooth muscle cells. Such teaching, taken with the teachings of other cited references, renders the instant invention obvious since proliferation of vascular smooth muscle cells would be resulted from angioplasty procedures (See teachings of Harrison). Therefore, employing the herein claimed photodynamic treatment method to inhibit the proliferation of vascular smooth muscle cells, which is resulted from angioplasty procedure, and thereby treating restenosis would be obvious.

Applicant's remarks with regard to Gonschior have also been addressed in the previous office action mailed December 3, 2003.

Applicant's remarks with regard to Examiner's position and remarks related to Eton et al. have been considered, but are not found persuasive. Examiner's remarks with regard to Eton is merely served as a response to applicant's remarks filed September 10, 2003 questioning Eton's failure to suggest the instant invention. Examiner's response mailed December 3, 2003 does not imply the rejection is based on Eton.

No unanswered arguments are seen to be present in the response filed May 3, 2004.